



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,384	06/27/2003	Jeffrey W. Carr	CARR-01000us4.002	7970
7590	01/05/2007		EXAMINER	
Sheldon R. Meyer FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY LLP Fourth Floor Four Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4156			VINH, LAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1765	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	01/05/2007		PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	10/608,384	
Examiner	CARR, JEFFREY W.	
Lan Vinh	Art Unit 1765	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/23/2006.
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) 21-34 is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-20 and 35-40 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-13, 16, 18-20, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takino et al. in Computer Numerically Controlled Plasma Chemical Vaporization Machining with a Pipe Electrode for Optical Fabrication, Applied Optics, Vol. 37, No. 2), pages 5198-5210

Takino teaches a method of polishing and shaping optics with a plasma torch. The method comprises the steps of: positioning a workpiece and a plasma torch (fig. 1), rotating/translating the workpiece with respect to a plasma torch (page 5200, section A; fig. 2), using reactive atom plasma processing to shape/remove/modify and deposit/add/redistribute material to the surface of the workpiece with the discharge from the plasma torch (page 5199, section B), the energy is transferred from a RF power source to create and sustain plasma discharge form the plasma torch (page 5199, introduction section; fig. 1, product/volatile reaction/material is deposited/added to the surface of the workpiece (fig. 1)

The limitation of claims 2, 5, 18, 40 have been discussed above
Regarding claims 3-4, Takino discloses that the removal or deposition of the substrate material caused by plasma-chemical reaction (page 5199, section B), which

reads on altering the chemistry of the surface of the workpiece. Takino is also silent about the damage to the workpiece underneath the surface

Regarding claim 6, Takino discloses a plasma beam source fed by highly reactive radicals (page 5199, section B). Regarding claim 7, Takino discloses placing a SF6/precursor gas in a central channel of the plasma torch (fig. 2)

Regarding claims 8-10, 20, Takino discloses controlling the flow of the precursor into the plasma torch is 50 ml/minutes (Table 1), which overlaps the claimed ranges.

Regarding claims 11, 13, Takino discloses introducing a plasma gas through an outer tube of the plasma torch and introducing an auxiliary gas (He) through a second of the tubes in the plasma torch (fig. 2)

Regarding claim 16, Fig. 1 of Takino shows that the plasma gas is introduced tangentially. Regarding claim 19, Takino discloses maintaining the processing chamber at about atmospheric pressure (page 5199, introduction section)

Regarding claims 38-39, Takino discloses using a translator/means for translating /rotating the wafer/workpiece (fig. 2), a plasma chamber 4 connected to RF power source to deposit material on the surface of the wafer/workpiece (fig. 2), which reads on means for using reactive plasma processing to transfer energy from a RF power source to sustain a plasma discharge and to deposit material on the workpiece, a conducting pipe/plasma torch/means for modify the surface with the discharge from the plasma torch (fig. 1, page 5199, section B)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takino et al. in view of Fabel (US 4,674,683)

Takino method has been described above. Unlike the instant claimed invention as per claim 17, Takino does not teach maintaining the temperature of the plasma torch between 5000* and 15,000* C.

Fabel teaches the temperature of plasma processes (col 1, lines 25-30)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to maintain the temperature of Takino's plasma torch process to between 50000 and 15,0000 C because Fabel teaches that this is the standard temperature range for plasma processes.

7. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Takino et al in view of Seo (US 6,534,921)

Takino method has been described above. Unlike the instant claimed inventions as per claims 14-15, Takino fails to disclose the step of introducing an auxiliary gas through a second concentric tube to keep hot plasma away from a central channel of the plasma torch/to adjust the position of a discharge

Seo discloses a method for removing residual material using a plasma jet system comprises the step of introducing an a gas through a second tube to cool plasma away from a central channel of the plasma torch (col 10, lines 26-45)

One skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to modify Takino method by adding the step of introducing an a gas through a second tube to cool plasma away from a central channel of the plasma torch as per Seo because according to Seo, the gas radical diffuse into the downstream region of the plasma and as the radical diffuse, their temperature cool down through radical expansion in a radial direction, i.e, the cross section of the radial interaction with the wafer/worpiece expands (col 9, lines 40-49)

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 21-34 allowed.

The reason for allowance of claim 21 has been stated in the previous office action

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments which argue that the reference of Bohm (DE 199 25 790 A1) uses an electromagnetic (EM) field radiated by a microwave antenna to create the discharge whereas the claimed RAPP, as recited in claims 1, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, transfers energy of a radio frequency (RF) power source to create and sustain the plasma discharge have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection based on Takino since Takino clearly discloses that the energy is transferred from a RF power source to create and sustain plasma discharge from the plasma torch (page 5199, introduction section; fig. 1)

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lan Vinh whose telephone number is 571 272 1471. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571 272 1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



LV
January 3, 2007